DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 637 CS 207 422

AUTHOR Brayfield, Peggy L.
TITLE Poetic License and Its Limits: An Essay on Word Order and Syntax in Poetic Language.
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 18p.
PUB TYPE Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Critical Reading; Dialects; English Instruction; Grammar; *Grammatical Acceptability; Higher Education; *Language Patterns; *Language Styles; Linguistic Difficulty (Inherent); Literary Criticism; *Literary Devices; *Poetry; *Syntax

ABSTRACT

Novice poetry readers need to realize that there are limits to poetic license, specifically with regard to the order of words in a sentence of poetry. For example, the integrity of independent clauses is not violated--no word placed in one independent clause is meant to be read as an element of another independent clause. Although parenthetical expressions can strike anywhere, dependent clauses, prepositional phrases, parallel or coordinate structure, and noun phrases also maintain their integrity, except in certain specifiable conditions. Poets are limited in their uses of adjectival relative clauses and verbals much in the same ways that prose writers are. Verb phrases, however, have very little integrity in nonpoetry, and almost none at all in poetry. Although these rules do not solve all the problems of reading poetry, they do indicate that even poetic license will usually submit itself to certain rules of syntax inescapable in any dialect of the English language. (An appendix contains excerpts from poems used in exercises on word order and syntax.) (JL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Peggy Brayfield

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Peggy Brayfield
Eastern Illinois University
Charleston, IL 61920

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED228637

Poetic License and Its Limits:

An Essay on Word Order and Syntax in Poetic Language

by Peggy L. Brayfield, Ph.D.

As always when I again face the experience of initiating novices into the mysteries of poetry--and this is what seems to be happening with the majority of students in my freshman lit course--I have been rethinking the problem of how to bridge the gap between a teacher's experience with the poetic medium, and the student's innocence. Privileged to share an office with a linguist, I often bend her ear to my confessions of frustration: why is even a relatively straightforward poem just a jumble of words to so many of my students? Perhaps, she says, this is because poetry is a stylistic dialect of the language it is written in, or (given differences in style among poets) a variety of dialects, or perhaps in extreme cases, an "idiolect" or private language. In order to perceive meaning in poetry the reader must have some knowledge (conscious or unconscious) of the ways this dialect differs from the language the readers themselves read, write and speak, as well as some notion of consistent, hence predictable, patterns within the dialect.[1]

With this insight--which offered me a striking and useful new view--I have tried to rethink my approach to teaching poetry, to analyze and predict what difficulties newcomers to poetry will experience with just the most basic elements of non-poetic dialect, and thus to lead them into a "reading knowledge" of this language which is not, for most of us, our

[1] I am indebted to my office-mate, Dr. Evelyn Ransom, for this helpful way of approaching the problem.

CS207422

"native tongue." And one of these basic and puzzling elements, for the learner, is the word order and syntax of poetry, especially of non-contemporary poetry. What follows is not, of course, aimed at our colleagues as readers who are thoroughly at home in poetric language, but as teachers who, like myself, may have problems with helping students to feel as at home in poetry as they need to be in order to appreciate it.

Many beginning readers of poetry, I find from my classes, have no reliable sense of how to discover the units of meaning, beyond the single word, within the poetic lines. Many take the line to be the poetic sentence, and since lines are often fragments, are halfway convinced than many or most poems are not written in sentences that have subject-predicate relationships. Many others, unable to grasp any syntactical units in a "dialect" that looks on the page so unlike the language they encounter in the morning paper, see each new poem as a random collection of words, from which readers construct "their own poems." With a little help, these students begin to look for the sentences within or beyond the "broken" lines of the poem, but they are puzzled to find that the order of words in these sentences, when they do succeed in isolating sentences, is often unlike the order of words in their everyday dialect. They can accept this as a form of poetic license, but unless they can at the same time realize what limits poetic license recognizes, they are back again to the jumble of words from which each reader must construct his or her own poem.

In order to help my beginning poetry readers work toward a solution to this problem--toward an understanding of the poet's poems, the experience the poets presumably thought they were structuring into the words they wrote--I selected out sentences from poems to exemplify various kinds of liberty poets have taken with the order of words in their sentences, and asked my students to put the words into an order more normal in non-poetic

English, without changing the meaning of the sentence.[2] Discussion of this exercise was as eye-opening to me (if not more so) than to my students.[3] Flexible as I fancied myself to be in regard to accepting various kinds of poetic license and cultivating appreciation of meaningful ambiguities, etc., I found myself saying, with total assurance, that some of my students' reordered versions of the poetic sentences in the exercises simply could not be what the original words intended. Then came the difficulty: Given the concept of poetic license, how could anybody be sure? If Frost wrote, "Something there is that doesn't love a wall," and that might mean "There is something that doesn't love a wall," how could I dogmatically rule out the possibility that it might mean "There is a wall that something doesn't love," or "There is something that a wall doesn't love"--both possibilities offered by students in my classes. To me, it was obvious that these readings were unacceptable--I have been using "the dialect" too long to be aware of how it strikes the novice--but I was as helpless to defend my stand as any native-speaker, unversed in the grammar of the language she uses every day, would be to defend her use of idioms to a foreigner who had built up no feeling for the ways of that strange language.

Grappling with this problem led me to attempt some formulation, admittedly tentative, of the syntactic rules of the dialect called poetic language. I work on an assumption that most poets write "dialect," not extreme "idiolect"--that they want their constructions of language to embody an experience that can be recovered by a sensitive reader, through the language that appears on the page of poetry. (This assumption may not, of

---

[2] See Appendix at end of paper for the sentences used and their sources.

[3] The types of misreading discussed as examples below are taken directly from or are derived by analogy from, misreadings submitted on these exercises by students in my classes.

course, have the force of self-evident truth to everyone.) The corollary to this basic assumption is that if there are no limits to poetic license, there is no reliable way for any reader to go about recovering even an approximation of the experience embodied in the words of a poem; thus, that even the most eccentric of poets, if they want to communicate, will work within limits set by the nature of the language they are using.

In this paper, I offer some hypotheses about what some of these limits to poetic license may be, specifically with regard to the order of words in a sentence of poetry.[4]

First, it seems to be true that the integrity of an independent clause will not be violated--that is, that no word placed in one independent clause is meant to be read as an element in another independent clause. Example: Wordsworth wrote, "Serene will be our days and bright,/And happy will our nature be." Despite the liberties he took with word order in both clauses of this compound, the reader may safely assume (mainly because the punctuation divides the two clauses clearly) that he did not intend the possible misreading, "Our days will be serene, and our nature will be bright and happy."

What of the integrity of various groupings of words within a sentence? With regard to the discussion that follows, there is one universal exception: the parenthetical expression. (This exception, however, is not peculiar to poetic language; it holds in non-poetic dialects as well.) No syntactical grouping, whether it be noun phrase, prepositional phrase, or whatever, is immune to the encroachments of the parenthesis, though the

---

[4]My observations here do not apply to concrete poetry, where words may function more as marks on the page than as language, nor to dada-type experiments with pure vocal sounds. Nor do I suggest how to solve the problem that sutdents must know some basic grammar in order to profit from the "rules" offered in this paper. Perhaps poetry, like foreign language, can serve to sharpen students' awareness of grammar if so taught.

more bizarre placements run the risk of sounding like parody. (Cummings plays with this potential when he writes of "that possibly most inexcusable/ of all to use a highfalutin phrase/luxuries" and "a scrumptious not to mention splendiferous funeral . . .")

Subject to the exception of the parenthesis, however, there are several kinds of syntactical groupings that seem to have an integrity even poetic license cannot hope to violate without sacrificing meaning; for instance, the dependent clause. It seems that in a complex sentence, no element meant as part of an independent clause will be placed within a dependent clause. Example: "Ask me no more where Jove bestows,/When June is past, the fading rose" cannot be read (as several of my students suggest) to mean "When June is past, ask me no more" etc. Nor can "With rue my heart is laden/For golden friends I had" be read, as one student rearranged it, "My heart is laden for golden friends I had with rue."

Next to be considered is the prepositional phrase, the elements of which can be separated only under certain clear limitations. Two common constructions allow the preposition to be separated from and preceded by its object, whether in poetry or otherwise: in the formation of questions ("What did you eat with?") and in relative clauses where the object serves as the relative pronoun ("The spoon that you were stirring with . . .")[5] Furthermore, in a few strictly limited ways, the order of elements in a prepositional phrase may be varied in poetic syntax. I know of one example where the object directly precedes the preposition in a poem ("Creep home and take your place there/The spent and maimed among"). And certainly it

---

[5]Purists may object to these separations of prepositions from their objects on grounds of style, but that need not be discussed here, as the construction is commonly understood and there is no question of loss of meaning resulting from separation.

would be possible for the modifiers of the object to directly follow, rather than precede it,[6] or for some to precede and some to follow it. Take for example Matthew Arnold's phrase, "with tremulous cadence slow," or Milton's "They hand in hand with wandering steps and slow/Through Eden took their solitary way."

Furthermore, the binding power of parallel and/or co-ordinate structure is very great, and may enable the poet to separate an element from its syntactical grouping without loss of clear grammatical relationship. I have found some cases of such separation involving prepositions having multiple objects or multiple modifiers with their objects. William Dunbar wrote, "I that in health was a gladness/Am troubled with great sickness." Burns wrote, "It wad frae monie a blunder free us/An' foolish notion." In similar cases, the subject and verb of a clause might even intervene, under certain circumstances, without destroying the syntactical tie for the reader: consider the hypothetical examples, "In deep sorrow they were, and pain," or "In heavy sorrow they were, and deep." Parallelism alone might even be able to sustain a syntactic connection in the absence of the coordinating conjunction, despite intervening sentence elements (as in this hypothetical example with a Beowulfian flavor to it: "A man of sorrow he was, deepest woe.") Here, though, the poet is treading the boundary between sense and confusion for the reader, and msot poets, I believe, choose the "sense" side of that boundary.

Without the ties of coordination and parallelism to lessen the strain of such separation, however, meaning breaks down when the prepositional phrase is broken up. Take as an example a Housman line: "Round that early-laurelled head/Will flock . . . the strengthless dead." Housman

---

[6] I refer to single adjective modifiers here, not to adjectival clauses or those verbal phrase modifiers which normally follow the noun they modify.

could not have conveyed the same meaning had he moved "early-laurelled" out of its prepositional phrase. Neither of the following variants, for example, would preserve that meaning (setting aside the separate question of stylistic defects):

Early laurelled, round that head will flock the strengthless dead.
OR: Round that head will flock early-laurelled the strengthless dead.

Clearly, both poets and non-poets must deal with a prepositional phrase on its own terms; the nature of our language sets definite limits to the ways such phrases may be rearranged without losing their meaning. A further observation on the integrity of prepositional phrases: whatever comes between a preposition and its object must be read as belonging to the object, and may not serve any other grammatical function in the poetic sentence.[7] The Housman sentence used above cannot be correctly read as "Round that laurelled head will early flock the strengthless dead" or "Round that strengthless early-laurelled head . . ." This is obvious enough when words are being used in commonly-accepted or non-figurative senses; it becomes harder for the reader to accept, however, as a poet's unconventional choices of words strain the reader's idea of what "makes sense." The inescapable limitions of English syntax then become a tool by which the poet may insist that the reader try to discover the meaning of the poem's imaginative combinations of words, rather than rearranging the words into more conventional combinations.

In examining another syntactic grouping, the noun phrase, one finds even greater integrity in the face of poetic license than demonstrated by the prepositional phrase. A structure beginning "the," "a," or "an" will inevitably lead to a noun, and what comes between must be read as modifying

---

[7]Such groupings may, of course, involve modifiers modifying other modifiers within the phrase. Also see note on "transferred epithet" below.

that noun (or modifying its modifiers). Demonstratives, and possessive nouns and pronouns may, of course, stand as substantives ("These are mine, but that is yours," "You keep yours and I'll keep mine"), but when they head a noun phrase, that phrase seems to have inviolable integrity in poetry as in non-poetry. Example: "That which her slender waist confined/ Shall now my joyful temples bind" is, out of context, ambiguous; but clearly the noun phrases cannot be broken up: the waist is slender, the temples joyful,[8] and not vice-versa.

A hypothetical example: No amount of poetic license, I believe, can render "Her radiantly beaming eyes were fixed on the sun as it rose," to mean "Her beaming eyes were fixed on the sun as it rose radiantly," or "Her eyes were fixed on the beaming sun," etc. ("Her eyes were fixed, radiantly beaming, on the sun" is possible, but does not violate the rule as stated.)

Granted, even novices seldom misread such examples as I have given here (though such misreadings did crop up sporadically in the exercises used in my classes), but the more startlingly unconventional the poet's word choice, the more likely that the average reader will assume violation of such phrases, and reassign the puzzling modifiers to more conventional groupings, even if this means putting them into other independent clauses. Thus, instead of grappling with this passage as Thomas wrote it: "The

---

[8]"Joyful temples" may be an example of "transferred epithet," however, by which an adverb modifying some stated or implied verb may be made into an adjective and attached to a noun. This occurs in ordinary language as well as in poetry, as for example, "to drink a quick cup of coffee." Wallace Stevens's phrase "chant their boisterous devotion to the sun" may be a poetic example, as is Yeats's rough beast "moving its slow thighs." This stylistic device poses a problem in the area where semantics overlaps grammar, which I am not prepared to discuss. However, I tentatively suggest that the reader is intended to consider the relationship (perhaps metaphoric) of the adjective to its noun before deciding that it is "transferred" and reassigning it to a more conventional function in the sentence.

spellbound horses walking warm/Out of the whinneying green stable/Onto the fields of praise," the student typically rearranges word order (either unconsciously, or consciously on grounds of poetic license) to read, "The spellbound whinneying horses walking warm out of the stable onto the green fields of praise." The novice's urge to "normalize," to change poetic language to commonplace, is very strong, it seems. "In the fell clutch of circumstance" is regularly misread as "He fell in the clutch of circumstance" among freshman readers!

In more difficult passages, readers (I tentatively submit) must be able to depend upon the idea that poetic license has recognizable limits, or they are lost. Only a firm intuition of the integrity of the noun phrase, it seems, can enable us to make sense of Thomas's "the mankind making/Bird beast and flower/Fathering and all humbling darkness" or Hopkins's "The rolling level underneath him steady sir." Without some concept of the bounds of liberty with regard to word-order, such lines are almost hopelessly enigmatic. But if we may here recognize the inviolable pattern "the plus adjectival modifiers plus darkness" and "the plus adjectival modifiers plus air," we are on firm, though strange, terrain.

To return to our examination of syntactic limitations, what of the placement of the adjectival relative clause? My tentative conclusion is that the nature of English does not allow poets any more license in this regard than prose writers enjoy, unless deliberate ambiguity is part of the desired poetic effect. In general, in poetry as in prose, an adjectival clause immediately following a noun will be read as belonging to that noun and to no other, unless punctuation, choice of relative pronoun, verb form, pronoun reference, or other strong indication rules out that meaning. In the hypothetical example, "The heart is filled with hatred/ That once was filled with love," parallel structure ties the relative clause

to "heart" rather than to "hatred." In "The eyes are filled with darkness/ That once were filled with light," the plural verb form joins with parallelism to override the tendency of the language to tie the clause to the nearest preceding noun. A problematic example is found in Matthew Arnold's "Growing Old," which may serve to demonstrate that poets run the same risks as non-poets when they trifle with our expectations in regard to word order:

> To hear the world applaud the hollow ghost
> Which blamed the living man.

Who "blamed the living man"--the ghost or the world? Contiguity leads one to say "ghost." The structure of antithesis points to "world." Lovers of irony may prefer the double irony of the hollow ghost blaming the living man while the world applauds. Admirers of ambiguity may accept and admire both readings. But I suspect that Arnold, writing before the recent glorification of embiguities in poetry, would be distressed at this relaxation of his control over meaning.

Probably most beginning students will be called upon to deal with relatively few unresolvably ambiguous examples such as this, however; they are more likely to develop into competent readers of poetry, I believe, if they see this as exceptional and common usage as the rule. Such an attitude could save them from such pitfalls as shown in the following example: "Many a poor man that roved, from a glad kindness cannot take his eyes." This cannot, of course, be taken to mean "Many a poor man cannot take his eyes, that roved, from a glad kindness." Several students in my classes offered a parallel misreading--even though they were given the sentence as Yeats wrote it· "Many a poor man that <u>has</u> roved" etc. The power of the stock phrase "roving eyes" upon their minds would seem to have overruled even the consideration of subject-verb agreement, so that they rendered the sentence thus: "Many a poor man cannot take his eyes, that has roved [<u>sic</u>], from a glad kindness.

The passages I chose to discuss with my students have limited the kinds of statements I can advance as hypotheses in regard to the limits of poetic license with word order. But I believe one would probably find that verbal (not verb) phrases (infinitives, gerunds, participles) by nature do not allow themselves to be treated with more license in poetry than in non-poetry. When using verbals as adjectival modifiers, the poet probably has no more freedom of placement than the prose writer; misplaced verbals will dangle just as inevitably and absurdly in poetry as elsewhere.

Furthermore, as syntactical groups they have the same integrity as dependent clauses, prepositional phrases, and noun phrases. Elements cannot be moved in or out of them at whim without change of meaning. Hypothetical examples: "Laughing quietly, the children ran down the hall" cannot be poetic license be taken to mean "Laughing, the children ran quietly down the hall." "He sometimes wished to be fervently loved" cannot mean "He fervently wished to be sometimes loved." (Placing an adverbial modifier of an infinitive before the infinitive--as some traditionalists advocate in order to avoid the "split infinitive"--may lead to unwanted ambiguity by which the adverb seems to belong with the main verb of the sentence: "He wished sometimes to be loved." Poets presumably must choose word-order with an awareness of this possibility, just like anyone else.)

As for verb phrases, it seems that they have very little integrity in non-poetry, and almost none at all in poetry. "He had surely been lying" seems no stranger than "He surely had been lying." Even "He had been surely lying" does not startle us much, so we are not much surprised to find Hopkins interrupting a verb phrase with part of its compound subject, when he writes "Nor mouth had, no nor mind, expressed/What heart heard of. . ."

What of the basic elements of a clause in poetry? How flexibly may a poet arrange subject, verb, and complements (using this term as traditional grammarians use it, to include direct and indirect objects and predicate nouns or adjectives)? As in non-poetry, placing the complement before the subject and verb is very common. Yet the pattern "subject precedes verb except in questions and commands" is very imperious (most especially when there is a direct object), even in poetry, and even when pronouns which should clarify by their case inflection are involved. "Ten thousand saw I at a glance" is clear enough because of the pronoun's case.[9] And if context made it inevitable, the reader would reluctantly consider "William" as subject of the clause "Ten thousand saw William at a glance." But no consideration of case, it seems, could make "William and me saw ten thousand," or even "Me saw ten thousand" come across, in poetry or in prose, with "ten thousand" as the subject. The first seems to be non-standard for "William and I saw," while the second seems to be a child's or non-native-speaker's mis-speech for "I saw."[10]

Before concluding, a few words in acknowledgement of the complexity of the subject I have tried to subdue so neatly to what is doubtless an oversimplified set of rules.

Poetry, for most of us, is not our mother tongue, though it is a related language. Some poetry, perhaps, is not so much dialect as an

---

[9]No non-standard usage substitutes nominative for objective case in such non-compound structures. But making the object compound ("Ten thousand saw William and I") would have the effect of making the reader take "William and I" to be the direct object, though context might persuade him that it is the subject.

[10]Even the singular-ending of a present tense verb cannot wipe out the feeling that subjects precede verbs in English. Consider: "Ten thousand sees the boy" (Subj.-Verb-Obj. or Obj.-Verb-Subj.?) "The boy sees ten thousand." "Him see ten thousand." (Few native speakers would perceive these latter as Obj.-Verb-Subj., despite the plural verb and the objective case of him.)

extreme idiolect, a language private to the person using it, an end in itself, not well suited for this reason to communicating. Of this kind of poetry I have said nothing, and indeed, profess to know almost nothing except that, resembling a code to be cracked, it would probably be too inaccessible for use in introductory classes such as I usually teach. But most poetry, I believe, can be approached as a dialect that may be understood in terms of the rules it tacitly follows, many of which, like those offered above, carry over from the non-poetic dialects of English. Poetic license of various kinds is possible, in English at least, because it confines itself to limits inherent in the language itself. Readers can make sense of "He sang his didn't, he danced his did," only because they know that his signals a noun to follow, and because the pattern of "Subject-Verb-Object" is so familiar as to seem almost inevitable to any speaker of English. Total license with word order in poetry would preclude communication. Without some firm and predictable syntactical structures, the reader could not even determine what part of speech a given word is, hence its possible range of meanings in its context.

And yet, knowing how subtly connotations of words interact to produce meanings in poetry, I offer the above hypotheses with some trepidation. Can one really say, when Dylan Thomas writes of spellbound horses walking warm from whinneying green stables onto fields of praise, that the adjectives don't spread their connotations across the whole context, making the horses "whinneying," the fields "green," the stable "warm," and even the speaker and reader to "praise"? Can one know, when Richard Eberhart says of the droves of boys assaulting the horse chestnut tree, "With shrill arms they fling to the higher branches," that he does not mean also to at least suggest the shrill voices of the boys, even as he ties that adjective

primarily to the noun arms?[11] And how far can we assume this kind of drift in meaning without reducing the poet's poem to our own amorphous blob, to be structured at our own whim? I don't pretend to know, but I have serious reservations about playing up such subtleties in classrooms where most students have never, independently, been able to see anything in poetry but amorphous blobs waiting for the inventive and untrammeled mind of each reader to make of them whatever she or he wishes. And such an approach, I believe, leads to the commission of all sorts of atrocities upon the poem the poet wrote.

In conclusion, it seems that even poetic license will usually submit itself to certain rules of syntax inescapable in any dialect of our language. Students will become better, more confident readers of that strange dialect, poetry, if they can be led to an awareness of the principle, "freedom works within limits," in the word-order of the poem.

Eastern Illinois University
Charleston

---

[11] Should these examples be read as "transferred epithet"?

Appendix of Excerpts from Poems Used in Exercises on Word Order and Syntax in Poetry. The examples included are those referred to in the body of my paper. (Some of them cannot be rendered "normal" by rearranging the words, and in some, no rearranging should be done, though the student will be sorely tempted to do so.)

1. Something there is that doesn't love a wall,
   That sends the frozen-ground-swell under it . . .
   Robert Frost, "Mending Wall"

2. Serene will be our days and bright,
   And happy will our nature be,
   When love is an unerring light,
   And joy its own security.
   William Wordsworth, "Ode to Duty"

3. Sol indulged in that possibly most inexcusable
   of all to use a high falootin phrase
   luxuries . . .

   but somebody who'd given my Uncle Sol a Victor
   Victrola and records while he lived presented to
   him upon the auspicious occasion of his decease a
   scrumptious not to mention splendiferous funeral with . . .
   E. E. Cummings, "Nobody Loses All the Time"

4. Ask me no more where Jove bestows,
   When June is past, the fading rose;
   For in your beauties orient deep,
   These flowers, as in their causes, sleep.
   Thomas Carew, "A Song"

5. With rue my heart is laden
   For golden friends I had,
   For many a rose-lipt maiden
   And many a lightfoot lad.
   A. E. Housman, "With Rue My Heart is Laden"

6. Creep home and take your place there
   The spent and maimed among;
   Pray God you find one face there
   You loved when all was young.
   Thomas Moore, "When All the World is Young, Lad"

7. Listen! you hear the grating roar
   Of pebbles which the waves draw back, and fling,
   At their return, up the high strand,
   Begin, and cease, and then again begin,
   With tremulous cadence slow, and bring
   The eternal note of sadness in.
   Matthew Arnold, "Dover Beach"

8. They, hand in hand, with wandering steps and slow,
Through Eden took their solitary way.
John Milton, "Paradise Lost," final lines

9. O wad some Power the giftie gie us
To see oursels as ithers see us!
It wad frae monie a blunder free us,
An' foolish notion . . .
Robert Burns, "To a Louse"

10. And round that early-laureled head
Will flock to gaze the strengthless dead,
And find unwithered on its curls
The garland briefer than a girl's.
A. E. Housman, "To an Athlete Dying Young"

11. That which her slender waist confined,
Shall now my joyful temples bind;
No monarch but would give his crown,
His arms might do what this has done.
Admund Waller, "On a Girdle"

12. So it must have been after the birth of the simple light
In the first, spinning place, the spellbound horses walking warm
Out of the whinneying green stable.
On to the fields of praise.
Dylan Thomas, "Fern Hill"

13. Never until the mankind making
Bird beast and flower
Fathering and all humbling darkness
Tells with silence the last light breaking . . .
Dylan Thomas, "A Refusal to Mourn the Death, by Fire,
of a Child in London"

14. I caught this morning morning's minion, king-
dom of daylight's dauphin, dapple-dawn-drawn Falcon, in his riding
Of the rolling level underneath him stead air, . . .
Gerard Hanley Hopkins, "The Windhover"

15. It is--last stage of all--
When we are frozen up within, and quite
The phantom of ourselves,
To hear the world applaud the hollow ghost
Which blamed the living man.
Matthew Arnold, "Growing Old"

16. And many a poor man that has roved,
Loved and thought himself beloved,
From a glad kindness cannot take his eyes.
W. B. Yeats, "A Prayer for My Daughter"

17. Nor mouth had, no mor mind, expressed
What heart heard of, ghost guessed:
It is the blight man was born for,
It is Margaret you mourn for.
Gerard Manley Hopkins, "Spring and Fall: To a Young Child"

18. They stretched in never-ending line
Along the margin of a bay:
Ten thousand saw I at a glance
Tossing their heads in sprightly dance.
William Wordsworth, "I Wandered Lonely As a Cloud"

19. anyone lived in a pretty how town
(with up so floating many bells down)
spring summer autumn winter
he sang his didn't he danced his did.
E. E. Cummings, "anyone lived in a pretty how town"

20. They will not pick them easily from the ground.
With shrill arms they fling to the higher branches,
To hurry the work of nature for their pleasure.
Richard Eberhart, "The Horse Chestnut Tree"